Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. VII, No. 25, *Issue Number* 334, JUNE 21, 1950 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN

STAND UP AND FIGHT

by Frank Chodorov

The fellows who shout for "free enterprise" should have learned an important lesson from a recent headline story in the New York Times.

The special committee of the House of Representatives investigating lobbying activities issued subpoenas designed to force three organizations to disclose the names of their financial backers. The subpoenas were directed at the executive officers. Two of them had already been cited for contempt by the committee, for failure to produce lists of the contributors, and one has been convicted and sentenced to serve four months for his obstinacy.

The three organizations are: Committee for Constitutional Government, National Economic Council, Constitutional Education League. Their business is pamphleteering; it is not even asserted by the investigating committee that they are engaged in any other activities, according to the news story (of May 27).

The literature put out by them is openly and unequivocally critical of the policies of the present administration. They urge less government spending, less taxation, less political intervention in private affairs; in fact, less government. Many of their pamphlets end up with the usual plea to "write your Congressman". Thus, they frankly admit the purpose of influencing legislation, as charged by the Democratic chairman of the committee. They hope to do so by marshalling public opinion behind the legislation they advocate.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of these organizations' work -- and this comment is not written in commendation or criticism -- such activity has not yet become illegal in this country. It is not yet "subversive" to oppose the party in power. The crime of lese majeste has not yet been written into the Democratic code.

But, the pin-pricking of critical literature is decidedly annoying to the "ins", and they are seeking relief in the Lobby Law, the purport of which is to expose to public view the interests plugging for legislation from which they hope to profit. In the present instance, there is not even the suggestion that the organizations are after some special privilege for their membership.

In fact, the chairman of the committee that issued the subpoenas denies any intention of looking into the activities of the organiza-

Copyright 1950 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions. Perhaps he is afraid the organizations might grab the opportunity to get their propaganda into the Congressional Record, if questioned about it. However, according to the chairman, all the committee wants is the lists of contributors and the amounts contributed. The question is, why do the "ins" want the information and why is it withheld?

The answer is all too obvious: The bureaucracy has at its disposal numerous legal and departmental means of annoying its annoyers, so as to silence them, and the supporters of these organizations are fearful of such reprisal measures. Business is sufficiently beset with the snooping bureaucratic agents these days, and government lawyers -- to justify their jobs -- are quick to fix up nuisance-value cases. Then, too, business is entirely too dependent on tax-money to thumb its nose at government; dividends and government spending are too closely related.

Taking everything into consideration, those who are spending money in the hope of directing public opinion against the political trend deem it wise to do so incognito.

II

The bureaucrat, however, is not to be warded off by pulling down the blinds; he has fangs and claws and, beast of prey that he is, he puts these to his use without inhibition.

That is the lesson that the forces opposed to the socialization of American life seem incapable of learning. They do not see, or will not admit, even to themselves, that the relations between Society and the State are no longer in equilibrium, that the State is in the ascendancy and intends to become top boss. If the State is to be stopped, it will be only by recognizing it as an enemy, and one with which you cannot do business without expecting to be destroyed.

Unless this fact is admitted, and met with courage, the institution of private property in this country will go the way it went in Russia or England, or in Hitler's Germany. The only possibility of saving the institution is by way of an all-out, knock-down fight with the forces of centralization. That kind of fight calls for leadership that is not afraid of a bloody-nose; certainly not the kind that hides behind an "executive secretary".

Socialism made headway only because its proponents never counted consequences. They not only chipped in all their pennies, but they stood up and proudly proclaimed their faith. They suffered derision for their doctrine, they went to jail for it. They got what they wanted because they fought for it.

Capitalism, on the other hand, has been strangely apologetic and timid. A few of its votaries, hidden in ivory towers, point out that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

private property is the necessary condition of production, that production and progress are synonyms, and that the abolition of private property is always followed by a decline in human values. The practitioners of capitalism, on the other hand, ignorant of their own philosophy, are ready to resort to compromise and appeasement whenever their position is attacked. They have even admitted, in one way or another, the charge of thievery made against capitalism by doctrinaire Socialists.

Pusillanimity is probably the inevitable consequence of easy living. Having found a comfortable adjustment in life, one loses the will to fight, and is quick to make concessions that do not too seriously threaten that adjustment. Coolies and slaves are like that, and the capitalist is made of the same stuff.

But, it should be evident that further compromise now means something more than sharing profits with the bureaucrat. Every concession hastens the ultimate extinction of capitalism and the ultimate is only a generation away. The drive of the power-crazed bureaucrat toward the abolition of private property is in full momentum -- there is no question about that -- and with the next "emergency" he will have achieved his purpose. Now is the time to fight, not conciliate.

III

The arrogance and impudence of the bureaucrat ought to convince the forces of private property that an understanding with him, based on any known principle, is impossible. In the news item above referred to, the staff report of the investigating committee is quoted as follows:

> "The Committee of Constitutional Government is one of the heaviest spending lobbies on record. Its filings under Section 305 of the [Lobby] act set out expenditures of $1,571,240.72 for the 38 months that the act has been in effect. This is an average of $40,000 a month."

Peanuts and fiddlesticks! Every hour of the day the agencies of the Government spend more than that monthly average to influence legislation, and the legislation they plug for is to lengthen their tenure, increase their appropriations, better their emoluments, strengthen their hold on the public purse. According to Postmaster General Donaldson, who wants more money to improve the position of his department, last year's taxpayer was milked of $149 million to cover cost of mailing government propaganda. What was the cost of printing it? Or clerk-hire?

The biggest, most pernicious, most unscrupulous and entirely selfish lobby in Washington is the Government. It is at work all the time; it has nothing else to do. Its list of "contributors" includes every man, woman and child in the country. And yet it has the effrontery to point

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the finger of scorn at an organization that digs up a piddling $40,000 a month for the printing and distribution of literature; mostly, in the opinion of this commentator, rather innocuous literature.

You can hardly blame the bureaucrat for his arrogance. His opposite number, the prudent, parsimonious capitalist, hiding comfortably behind an organizational smoke screen, does not arouse much admiration. Who was it who said that nice people deserve to lose?

IV

If the institution of private property is to be saved, it needs bold, uncompromising and intelligent championship. It needs leaders who put principle above profits, ideals above convenience. It needs men who, like the signers of the Declaration of Independence, are willing to risk their necks for what they know to be right.

Above all things, capitalism needs an intelligent and forthright press. It is interesting to note that long before Socialism got hold of the country's tax-fund, its lean and hungry advocates maintained vigorous, well-edited dailies, weeklies and monthlies. They were widely read; that they had influence is evidenced by the current of legislation this past 20 years.

Capitalism is too poor to support anything with pretensions to character and influence. It has virtually no press.

While capitalism snoozed in comfort, Socialism got its foot into the door of our educational system, edged its body in, and now has taken over the entire establishment. For nearly three decades the disciplines taught in our schools of higher learning have taken on a collectivistic hue, so that the graduates are completely unaware of the philosophy of individualism underlying the capitalistic economy. They simply know nothing about it, can't recognize its phrases when they hear them. Our schools need a complete overhauling if capitalism is not to become a lost art and a dead language.

The job is entirely too big for the few organizations that must confine their efforts, for lack of funds, to the inadequate job of issuing pamphlets. The best brains obtainable, including those now concentrating on the making of money, must be put to the fight. Above all, there must be an awareness that capitalists have nothing to lose but the chains that are tightening about them.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VII, No. 25

By Frank C. Hanighen June 21, 1950

TOKYO CONFERENCE: It is reliably reported to this column that General MacArthur will give his views on the Far Eastern situation via an international radio broadcast, if the State Department does not yield to his desire to defend Formosa. This is one specter at the table of the conference in Tokyo, where Defense Chief Louis Johnson is talking things over with MacArthur.

The other specter at that feast is the Philippines. The plight of that country is one of the vital considerations in our Far Eastern policy today. Formosa and Indo-China might go to the Communists without stirring up the American people. But the loss, or imminence of loss, of the Philippines would have a strong effect on popular opinion in America. MacArthur feels that Formosa is necessary to the defense of the Philippines -- that the latter would fall if the Chinese Communists were to take over Formosa.

Hence the urgency of the Tokyo meeting. There is a distinct possibility that MacArthur may "sell" Secretary Johnson on his ideas. But it does not follow that Johnson, on his return to Washington, will "sell" the State Department. Observers here note that some of the same old "China gang" which sold out Chiang Kai-shek are around the Far Eastern Division of the State Department and will have a voice in the fate of the Philippines. That is the negative factor. The positive factor is that there are signs in the press that a reconsideration of the hitherto fatalistic policy toward Formosa is changing -- vide the New York Times editorial of June 19. Policy planning for the Far East is reaching a climax.

* * * * *

RACKET PROBE: Not only is the Administration's crime investigation a "diversion", to dim the spotlight on the subversive probes; but there is a "diversion within a diversion" -- that is, a reported diverting of key crime figures to places less "hot" than Washington. Republicans claim that certain former racketeers have been staying around Washington in recent years, moving in Democratic circles; and the Republicans want to know why these men have disappeared from the Capital scene since the racket probe started. Did someone in the Government tell them to make themselves scarce?

* * * * *

GOP CHANCES IN ELECTIONS: Will the GOP repeat its success of 1946, this year? Attempts to answer this question naturally bring up discussion of the results -- and their causes -- of all the off-year Congressional elections since 1932. It would be only human for Republican workers to draw inspiration from their triumphant landslide of four years ago. They can say, with truth, that at this time in 1946, there was much uncertainty in GOP claims for victory and that even up to the eve of the '46 elections few expected the Democrats to lose the Senate. Yet Republican hopefuls this year overlook vital differences. Consulting files for 1946, we note the dominating political importance of the OPA fight. No such issue, affecting every pocketbook, exists today. The GOP cannot raise its unanswerable taunt of four years ago, "Had Enough?" The issue raised by the McCarthy charges might be just as potent; but nationally the GOP seems too fastidious to exploit it.

There is, therefore, a tendency among more sober Republicans to recall lovingly the year 1942. The outcome in that election was pretty good for the Republicans: they won 10 Senate and 44 House seats. The result in the House was to leave

Copyright 1950 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Democrats with an over-all majority of only a few votes. It could be that the GOP will this year approximate the 1942 gains in the House; but few believe any similar advance in the Senate is possible next fall. Drawing a parallel with '42 is hazardous. Then, we were in the war, and no clearly-seen victories had yet come to sway the voters. The farmers were chafing under war controls and had not yet attained their later prosperity. And the Administration, absorbed in global politics, neglected the Congressional elections. Today, the latter can hardly be said in view of the exertions of Mr. Bill Boyle and his merrie men. About all one can say is that agricultural prices have fallen and a number of rural and semi-rural constituencies should return to the Republican banner. But hardly a number sufficient to constitute a landslide.

What about the two other off-year elections (since 1932)? Well, the contest in 1938 resulted in great GOP gains in both houses. But the "New Deal depression" accounted for the happy outcome -- that and the silly White House attempt to purge Right Wing Democrats. No such conditions exist now, and rule out any parallel. The race in 1934, however, does deserve attention. In that year, the Democrats raised their representation in the House and Senate, and the level reached was only exceeded in the Presidential landslide of 1936. The reasons are well known: the New Deal had wider popularity than before or since; its restrictions had not rubbed many people the wrong way; and Harry Hopkins produced his sovereign remedy, leaf-raking by the CWA. Finally, the country was coming out of the great depression and hope was spreading.

Republicans would be wrong to dismiss this year of 1934 as history too ancient to be relevant. There is a parallel. In 1950, Truman's Fair Deal is in its infancy. Its mass bribery of voters is hardly unpopular; the inevitable restrictions have not yet come to cause discontent. Business and employment are excellent. Could another 1934 happen? Personally, we don't think so. But it is a possibility that Republicans may make such an insignificant gain in seats that the practical effect would be much the same. For now that the Welfare State is far better entrenched than ever before; and now that -- thanks partly to the Vandenbergs and Margaret Chase Smiths -- the two party system is disintegrating, a mediocre showing of the GOP in 1950 might erase all hope. Let's face it.

* * * * *

LOYALTY BOARD: (Edna Lonigan reports from the Hill.) One of the mysteries about the persistent employment of Leftists in the Federal service is the curious failure of the loyalty investigations. This is what people unfamiliar with Washington find it hardest to understand. Seth W. Richardson, chairman of the President's Loyalty Board, gave a clue to the mystery in a recent interview. He said, quite rightly, that the Commission did not regard membership in a Communist organization in college as proof of disloyalty, and then went on to connect college "idealism" with charges that employees had been accused of delivering confidential Government documents in wartime to a member of the espionage ring of a foreign Power. Obviously the two points are quite different.

Richardson further said that he was concerned only with "loyalty" defined strictly as working for the overthrow of the Government of the United States. But Hiss never worked for the overthrow of our Government. He merely used it. The Soviet Union long ago abandoned the naive idea of overthrowing the American Government. It is simpler to penetrate the Government and manage it to Soviet advantage. Such activity is not legally a crime and it cannot be punished as a crime. It constitutes a very damaging threat to our security, and the American people want to know how to end that threat, but Mr. Richardson tells them he will have nothing to do with it. That is why "clearance" by a loyalty board has no meaning.

Such confusion is hard to understand unless Mr. Richardson was chosen because he is confused. Who picked the 70-year-old Republican? The Communists knew, when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the loyalty program was proposed, that it might prove serious for them. They would certainly favor picking a candidate who might be confused on the issue, as the best way to keep the public confused, and even keep Mr. Truman in the dark.

If the Loyalty Board takes no cognizance of saboteurs of policy, provided they have not spied for Russia, and if Russia relies more on sabotage of policy than on espionage, the President's loyalty program covers no essential part of the problem at all. The Tydings sub-committee cannot afford to drop its investigation of Communist influence in Government until it finds out exactly what territory the Loyalty Board covers and what kinds of sabotage of American security the Board ignores.

What is there in this investigation that drives the State Department to such lengths? As the probe goes on, the Executive arm grows more desperate and violent in its efforts to smother the matter. The record proves what most knowledgable people believed, that President Truman in the Amerasia case had no part in delaying justice. The FBI is also in the clear. Who then wants so desperately to keep something hidden? The trouble is in the "upper echelons of Government", in the layers close to the top, but not in the public eye. We need the Senate searchlight turned on this layer now.

* * * * *

TWO BILLIONS FOR WASTE: Miss Lonigan goes on -- During debate on the budget, it was clear enough that Congress could never re-establish control of spending at the budget end. It is the authorizations for new spending, passed gayly throughout the year, that tie the hands of economizers at budget time. The only effective attack on spending lies in blocking new commitments. The perfect case arose in the recent bill to give the Commodity Credit Corporation two billions to buy farm commodities for storage.

The CCC is a bank which buys surplus wheat, corn, potatoes, cotton, eggs, to keep up their prices. It has a capital of $4,750 million, nearly half of which is invested in outright purchase of farm crops for storage. The CCC today, wants another two billion because its assets are gone -- invested not in farm mortgages or commercial paper but in commodities kept off the market and stored at great expense. It was supposed to buy when prices were low, and sell when the prices were high. But politically prices are never "high" and the assets are never sold. Thus CCC has become simply a spending agency which may devour about two billions a year. It is hardly surprising that the budget keeps rising.

The Administration argues that Congress cannot "let the farmers down". Senator Williams who led the attack on the bill, showed that present farm prices are kept much higher than the average price for the war and post-war decade. He proposed an amendment correcting the evil at the point of loss, by lowering parity prices, but he was defeated. Senator Ives pointed out that this two billion expenditure could cure nothing. He said, "The sole effect of this additional extravagance is to purchase -- at a fantastically exorbitant cost -- the limited period of time . . . before we are confronted again with this same state of affairs."

Williams also made the point that the CCC had submitted none of the records required by Congress, and there were large errors in what it did submit. He said rightly that if Congress did not insist on the reports it should amend the law. But the problem here is that when Big Spending comes in, accounting goes out. Government "accounting" is bound to be fraudulent, when there is no free market.

More serious than the spending, or the lack of accounting, is the possibility of Government control of the food supply. The small group of men who know the rules of power know that they must get control of the food supply. The area of control is spreading, over prices and production on the farm, over supplies and over outlets. The net is closing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

Roosevelt from Munich to Pearl Harbor, by Basil Rauch. New York: Creative Age Press. 527 pp. $4.50. Reviewed by W. H. Chamberlin.

This is a thick-and-thin apologia for Franklin D. Roosevelt's foreign policy during the three years which elapsed between Munich and Pearl Harbor. Even Robert E. Sherwood does not go so far in justifying all the President's words and actions.

Inevitably the book has been greeted with a dutiful chorus of praise by reviewers who feel an emotional vested interest in vindicating the Roosevelt record. A review in the New York Times characterized the work as a "dispassionate analysis".

One could hardly imagine a less accurate characterization, for the author's mood is one of violent bias. He avowedly sets out to annihilate the criticisms of the late Charles A. Beard, and others who find in Roosevelt's own policies much of the responsibility for Pearl Harbor. According to Mr. Rauch, the thesis of the Roosevelt critics is "based on omissions, distortions and falsifications".

The America First Committee, in this "dispassionate analysis", "launched a bitter campaign". But, as for the leading interventionist organization, the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, "its methods were honorable and its arguments reasonable". Similar semantic abuses are scattered through the book. The author seems temperamentally incapable of recognizing that opponents of American involvement in the war could be honorable and patriotic in their motives -- and may well feel themselves intellectually vindicated by the post-war aftermath.

In his duel with Beard, Mr. Rauch comes out second best. The author accuses Beard of almost completely ignoring Hull's part in shaping American foreign policy. But if one turns to Beard's President Roosevelt and the Coming of War, 1941, one finds a column of references to Hull in the index. Beard certainly devotes the fullest attention to Hull's inflexible attitude in negotiating with Japan and to the significance of his November 26 note, which the Army Board called "the document that touched the button that started the war".

Professor Rauch makes the familiar polemical mistake of claiming too much for his hero. "The President", he says, "submitted his argument to the people and Congress for judgment." It is not easy, even with the casuistry in which the author displays considerable skill, to reconcile this claim with the factual record of 1940-41. Congress was not consulted on such vital decisions as the destroyer deal; the occupation of Iceland; the preparation to establish an American naval base in Northern Ireland. Anyone who was in Washington in the hectic pre-war period knows that Senators were kept completely in the dark as to Roosevelt's intentions and purposes. The innumerable promises that "your country is not going to war", faithfully recorded in Beard's work, are not in harmony with the author's synthetic portrait of a candid Roosevelt, eager to keep Congress and the people in touch with his unfolding policy. A more realistic line of defense is that of Thomas A. Bailey, a Roosevelt sympathizer, who, in The Man in the Street, admits that "Franklin Roosevelt repeatedly deceived the American people during the period before Pearl Harbor", but argues that this was for their own good.

Professor Rauch's work reflects a good deal of erudition. But this is vitiated by the constant attempt to maintain untenable propositions, and by the conscious or unconscious refusal to face up to some very pertinent questions. Why, especially in the light of present Chinese developments, should the United States have felt obligated to risk war with Japan for the sake of China? Is there any evidence that Hitler intended to attack the American continent? And one is tempted to gasp when the author, in this year of the cold war and the Atlantic Pact, finds tremendous significance in the United Nations Declaration of 1942. One recalls the old saying: "The mountain labored . . ."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European Supplement *to* Human Events Vol. VII, No. 25

By Bertrand de Jouvenel PARIS -- June, 1950

ENGLAND TURNS DOWN THE SCHUMAN IDEA: Political forecasting is a thankless job. I recently looked up what the wise men had to say, in 1945, about foreign policy when the Labor Party took over in Britain. They feared that Socialist government would prove blindly complacent to Soviet imperialism, but hoped it would forward freer trade between nations, especially in Europe. The fear proved ill-founded, and so was the hope. Whatever the judgment on the internal achievements of Socialism, History may deal with its European policy under the heading of "lost opportunity". Enjoying an enormous prestige by virtue of having been the stronghold of Europe, England enhanced this by its drive to the Left, in a moment of extreme Leftism all over Europe. Britain then stood out as the natural leader of European co-operation.

This called for rapid economic demobilization, which the American loan, I understand, was meant to allow. But, determined to build up a Good Society within their island fold, the Socialists made it a Closed Society. Not by chance, in his profound work, The Open Society, Dr. Karl Popper (of the London School of Economics) has shown that "from Plato to our day", as he puts it, the design of a Good Society has always been coupled with the walling up of a Closed Society.

I do not mean here to malign the actual behavior of England towards her weaker European neighbors; even in her difficulties she managed to treat them generously in many economic transactions, and in particular she several times helped out France. But individual moves could not remedy the lack of an inspired and inspiring policy. They have remained unknown to the Continental public which receives the impression that England's psychological attitude is simply -- fear of foreign trespass on Socialist gardening.

Men are prone to appreciate symbolic gestures more than concrete deeds. Continental opinion is unconscious of Britain's extreme moderation in the apportioning of American aid: England might well have claimed over 40 per cent of the total allowance on the basis of her pre-war imports (these then formed some 40 per cent of the total imports of the now participating countries and over 45 per cent of the imports from the non-participating countries). Continental opinion is further unaware of the facilities we owe to the existence of the vast sterling area. On the other hand, the Continent has reacted most strongly to England's "individualism" in devaluing the pound last year without warning. And now the turning down of the Schuman idea is another unfortunate gesture.

Definitely committing oneself to achieving something indefinite is repugnant to some minds, including my own. And in the tussle about wording between London and Paris, my sympathies lay with the former. I would like to think that Whitehall felt suddenly surfeited with the nebulous terms of the planning vocabulary and could not stomach "pooling of productions": "pooling" may mean anything from the merging of properties to the establishment of a free market; (in my view, productions would be "pooled" within an area if anyone within the area could have access to them on the same terms, untrammelled by price discrimination, exchange restrictions, tariffs and quotas). It would be, however, over-optimistic to explain the British evasion by such an upsurge of logical purism. Continental opinion is convinced that England would not go along because the idea involved some form of internationalization, and regards this as a glaring instance of British isolationism.

* * *

FRANCE AND GERMANY COME TOGETHER: Whatever its economic substance, the Schuman proposal is essentially a political move, and, as such, of the utmost importance. With dramatic suddenness, France has reversed her attitude toward Germany. Up to

Copyright 1950 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now she struggled to retard the reinstatement of Germany: those who opposed this policy doubted whether they were making any headway and feared that we would give way only inch by inch, grudgingly. Then comes the Schuman offer which implies a footing of equality. From the point of view of French internal politics, the suggestion was courageous: and even more so the blunt statement that Franco-German solidarity was to be established in place of a long-standing antagonism. Courage is well rewarded, for the idea met with an amazing reception in this country: no dissenting voice of any importance was raised.

Such popularity brings to life, or to light, a number of Franco-German projects: French leaders of the chemical industry are holding talks at Frankfort with their German counterparts; it is proposed that a German electric railway running on the right bank of the Rhine shall be fed from Alsatian power stations; French and German farmers have conferred and agreed that the establishment of a single market for agricultural goods would be to their mutual advantage; it is revealed that French and German insurance companies have been studying for some time the means of expanding into each others' territories. It looks, in short, as if on both sides there was needed but a signal to set things going. The "pooling" proposal whatever its fate, will have catalyzed quite a lot of less conspicuous achievement.

It is the political aspect, and importance, of the Schuman move which makes English reserve especially deplorable. Good friends of England are cold-showered by her abstention. Also a number of French and German Socialists take their cue from the Socialist government of Britain. Another Continental reaction is more worrying. A "let's go ahead without England" spirit is developing, which is not keeping within reasonable bounds. One hears all too often that "England after all returns to her traditional policy of dividing Europe". And though this is an absurd misreading it is not a harmless one. It is to be feared that some will lay upon "British machinations" the difficulties which must inevitably arise in the present venture. There was a time when I scorned such inventions as belonging to a cheap-spy-story conception of world affairs: they do, but I have learned from experience that this type of explanation gains wide acceptance and causes great damage. A diplomacy attuned to our age of presumptuous ignorance should be on its guard against misrepresentation.

* * *

NEUTRALITIS: The Schuman suggestion was the occasion for another outburst of neutralitis: "Let's all be neutral together!" This has worried some American commentators, though surely it is better that those who utter such a sentiment, the neutralites, should work towards the organization of Europe, in the hope that it will be a neutral Europe, than that they should oppose it.

The mounting tide of neutralitis puzzles American opinion. The shepherd may declare himself neutral between the wolf and the lamb; he is only a bad shepherd. But if the lamb declares itself neutral between the shepherd and the wolf, it is a very foolish lamb indeed, or a thoroughly frightened one. It should be explained to Americans that Europe indeed is very frightened.

Continental Europeans picture the third war as a formidable process of destruction in which they are cast for the part of passive victims. They expect Russian occupation at the outset, followed by wholesale deportation of elites, which will not be heard of again. Then occupied Europe must work for the Eastern camp, altering against America the balance of economic power (a point often missed), which in turn will oblige our American friends to bomb our productive capacities, and incidentally our towns, out of existence. Nor shall they have any means of liberating the sorry remnant other than to atomize the enemy out of the way. The prospect is a dramatic one and the Communists are clever indeed to print at this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time in their evening paper the account of a Russian war correspondent with the American armies, Lt. Col. Kraminov, who gives a terrifying account of the levelling down process by which the liberating armies forced their way open. This is being read by many besides the Communists and makes a great impression. Thus the public is well prepared for "neutralite" preaching, and eager to believe against reason that neutrality can be preserved.

Of course the foregoing view can be refuted; if Europe builds up her strength sufficiently, she won't be invaded, and indeed the war will not happen, the balance of forces swinging westwards. But Continental Europeans are conscious that security by strength is a long way off. Responsible American papers have recently taken to giving what seems to us a fantastically over-optimistic picture of the progress in Western defense. Continental Europeans have no confidence in their national armies, feel they cannot severally afford to build them up on a modern scale, are very skeptical of combinations of national armies which break down easily. They will gain confidence only when a properly European army is set up; a new model, not handicapped by deeply-imbedded national routines, and drawing its strength from the whole of free Europe.

The neutralites however point out that the building up of a reliable European force is a long process, and that Russia will not allow it to be completed, especially if she thinks of it as the European arm of a Western coalition. This is a good point insofar as it is a warning against chest-thumping proclamations that the door will be locked at some future date, insofar as it stresses the necessity for an interim protection of Europe by American presence, and again insofar as it reminds us that we should never tire of making it clear our coalition is a purely defensive one. But neutralites are entirely convinced -- and this is where they go off the rails -- that the danger to Europe is not the primary factor of European insecurity, that the primary factor is the Russian suspicion of American intentions and European complicity. Therefore, in their view, the program of European security becomes a tormenting one only because we have gone and allied ourselves with the Americans.

Thus Sartre, the best-advertised philosopher in the world, holds that the Atlantic Pact was not meant by American policy to ward off from Europe a non-existent Russian threat, but to enlist on the American side in the cold war the moral prestige of European democracies which are held by Sartre to represent the conscience of the world because they are weak. I perceive here a cult of the "foolish virgins" which Scripture does not authorize. However our philosopher goes on to explain that the whole purpose of the American Republic in extending a mock protection is to cause the rape of the foolish virgins (my vocabulary) thereby obtaining a casus belli. The Americans, he argues, cannot fail to know that Europe in case of war would be divided against itself; therefore useless. Its only use then is to constitute a Pearl Harbor.

This is a striking, but by no means exceptional, example of neutralist reasoning, such reasoning being in almost every case based upon fantastically distorted data. The basic assumption in neutralist reasoning is that the Russian threat to Western Europe arises indirectly as a consequence of our being associated with the American threat to Russia. That the world crisis arises from an American threat to Russia is of course the major axiom of Russian policy: its adoption underlies the neutralist campaign. The kick-off in this campaign was given by the evening paper Le Monde, which has stepped into the shoes of Le Temps: it was signed by a member of the French Academy, M. Gilson, who achieved fame as a historian of medieval philosophy. The campaign has been steadily sustained by Le Monde, although its editor, M. Beuve-Méry, as a pre-war correspondent to Prague (and an excellent one) should remember that Hitler took as his pretext for the destruction of Czechoslovakia that it threatened German security, as an advanced platform for Russian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

planes. Surely when the Russians call Western Europe a bridgehead for American aggression, they are using an age-old device, which many imperialists made use of before Hitler! To complete the picture, it should be said that an MRP (Christian Democrat) member of Parliament introduced a bill to proclaim French neutrality. All this began in February and March, 1949.

Of the response to the neutralist campaign, this is to be said: no responsible party or responsible politician has to date joined in; indeed the Socialist parties in their Copenhagen meeting, turned the suggestion down most severely. But on the other hand the idea is pushed very hard by a fellow travelling group on the Left and by followers of the famous nationalist Maurras on the Right. This strange combination reproduces the pre-war pattern with amazing fidelity. Then, as now, a Rightist and a Leftist group waged a strong campaign against the demands of collective security, on the score of "sacred selfishness" on the Right and pacifism on the Left.

Finally, I must explain why I have spoken throughout of neutralitis rather than neutralism: it is because this attitude gains (or loses) ground more like an illness than as a policy: it is indeed, at least in the public which welcomes it, an outcome of the feeling of insecurity which prevails.

* * *

PROBLEM OF REARMAMENT: It is hardly surprising that Western Europe should feel insecure. While this has been for centuries the locus of military power, its military effort is now at an all time low. Never has military expenditure formed so small a part of public expenditure as it does today: this is true of the area taken as a whole, its average effort being of course lowered by the disarmament of Western Germany and the ceiling imposed by treaty upon the forces of Italy; but it is also true of France and, to a lesser degree, of England. One may also surmise, though this opinion cannot be supported by reliable figures, that seldom has so small a portion of the gross product, of the real output of the countries, been devoted to the military effort.

It is one thing to say that the military effort is a remarkably small part of public expenditures, and quite another to say that there is ample room in the budgets for more military expenditure. The latter has been pushed aside, has made way for other expenditures which could not easily be cut down, upon which the cost of rearmament would have to be superimposed. Rearmament would not only be expensive in terms of public funds but also in terms of real resources. In Belgium and Italy there is a distinct slack in the utilization of national resources and it is possible that a program of rearmament might not interfere badly with the satisfaction of the present demands upon the national product. But British economy on the other hand is over-extended as it is, its resources are fully engaged in satisfying present demands and some of these would have to be drastically cut down to make way for a greater military effort.

France stands midway: there is undoubtedly an increasing slack in the utilization of national resources: nonetheless a serious program of rearmament would imply some sacrifice of other demands. It seems clear that rearmament could not be pushed ahead without inflation; that is, incomes distributed would forge ahead of goods made available and either prices would leap forward or controls would have to be reintroduced.

Thus the rearmament of Europe offers a bleak political prospect. One that seems most undesirable to the precariously balanced governments which are to be found almost everywhere in Europe at this moment.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED